

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

LINEAR TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 06-476 (GMS)
)	
MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**LINEAR'S PROPOSED FINAL VERDICT FORM AND LINEAR'S
OBJECTIONS TO MONOLITHIC'S PROPOSED FINAL VERDICT FORM**

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Karen Jacobs Loudon (#2881)
James W. Parrett, Jr. (#4292)
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Linear Technology Corporation

OF COUNSEL:

Raphael V. Lupo
Joel M. Freed
Matthew G. Cunningham
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 756-8000

Jimmy Shin
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
3150 Porter Dr.
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 813-5000

June 25, 2008

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

I. INFRINGEMENT

- A. Do you find that Linear has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Monolithic has directly infringed, induced infringement, and/or contributorily infringed any of the following patent claims?

A "YES" answer is a finding for Linear. A "NO" answer is a finding for Monolithic.

'178 Patent Claim No.	Direct		Induced		Contributory	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1						
2						
34						
41						
55						

'258 Patent Claim No.	Direct		Induced		Contributory	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1						
2						
3						
34						

If you have answered "YES" anywhere in I.A., proceed to B. Otherwise, skip to Section II. below.

- B. Do you find that Linear has proven by clear and convincing evidence that Monolithic's infringement was willful?

A "YES" answer is a finding for Linear. A "NO" answer is a finding for Monolithic.

Patent No.	Yes	No
'178		
'258		

II. VALIDITY

- A. Do you find that Monolithic has proven by clear and convincing evidence invalidity of any of the following claims by reason of anticipation or obviousness?

A "YES" answer is a finding for Monolithic. A "NO" answer is a finding for Linear.

'178 Patent Claim No.	Anticipation		Obviousness	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1				
2				
34				
41				
55				

'258 Patent Claim No.	Anticipation		Obviousness	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1				
2				
3				
34				

- B. For claim(s) found invalid for anticipation, identify the single piece of prior art relied on for that determination. For claim(s) found invalid for obviousness, identify the item(s) of prior art relied on for that determination.

Each juror must sign the verdict form to reflect that a unanimous verdict has been reached.

Dated: _____, 2008

FOREPERSON

LINEAR'S OBJECTIONS TO MONOLITHIC'S PROPOSED FINAL VERDICT FORM

1. Linear objects to the omission of Linear's claim for willful infringement in Monolithic's Questions on infringement in Section I. That Monolithic may disagree with such a claim provides no basis for denying Linear a jury verdict on it. It is also relevant to Linear's claim that this is an exceptional case.

2. Linear objects to Question II.A on validity because Monolithic has failed to provide for identification of references on which any invalidity finding would be based, an identification that presents a more complete and necessary record for any post trial motions or appeal.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP
/s/ James W. Parrett, Jr.

OF COUNSEL:

Raphael V. Lupo
Joel M. Freed
Matthew G. Cunningham
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 756-8000

Jimmy Shin
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
3150 Porter Dr.
Palo Alto, CA 94304
(650) 813-5000

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Karen Jacobs Loudon (#2881)
James W. Parrett, Jr. (#4292)
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Linear Technology Corporation

June 25, 2008
2365517.2

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on June 26, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following:

Richard L. Horwitz
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

I also certify that copies were caused to be served on June 26, 2008 upon the following in the manner indicated:

BY HAND & EMAIL

Richard L. Horwitz
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
1313 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899

BY EMAIL

Dean G. Dunlavey
Mark A. Flagel
Robert Steinberg
Sean Pak
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
633 West Fifth Street, Ste. 400
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Mark Kachner
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
650 Town Center Drive
20th Floor
Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1925

David McKone
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Sears Tower, Suite 5800
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago IL 60606

Claude M. Stern
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &
HEDGES, LLP
Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Richard I. Werder, Jr.
Eric Huang
Carlos A. Rodriguez
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &
HEDGES, LLP
New York, NY 10010

Bruce Zisser
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &
HEDGES, LLP
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Alison E. Monahan
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER &
HEDGES, LLP
San Francisco, CA 94111

/s/ James W. Parrett, Jr.

jparrett@mnat.com (#4292)